



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

work is expanded to somewhat excessive length owing to the necessity under which the author labors of explaining many matters in detail which would be too obvious or too familiar to require such treatment in a work addressed solely to American readers.

The volume deals not only with the legal aspects of the doctrine of separation of powers but also treats of the influence brought to bear upon governmental practice by such political questions as those of the federal financial régime and slavery, from the two respective compromises of 1833 and 1820 down to 1860. The primary object, however, which the author has in view in this volume is the presentation of the legal application of the theory of the separation of powers as actually found in the constitutional documents of the federal and state governments, together with a critical résumé of the commentaries upon the theory found in the writings of such American political thinkers as Calhoun and Webster. The work gives evidence of an amount of research which is distinctly creditable to one working at a distance from some of the more important sources of information.

In the subsequent volume which the author promises to issue, the political side of the question will be more fully dealt with, and particular attention will be given to the influence of politics upon the enlargement and restriction of the three powers in such cases as are left doubtful or omitted entirely in the original Constitution.

J. M. MATHEWS.

Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Sozialismus. By DR. OTTO WARSCHAUER. (Berlin: 1909. xvi-402.)

This admirable book is designed to be part of a larger study of Socialism and Communism in the nineteenth century, and is based upon lectures delivered some years ago in the university of Leipzig.

The author holds that, no matter what views one may entertain as to Socialism, the history of its development properly belongs to the general history of culture and as an integral part of it possesses a permanent significance. He warns the reader against confounding Socialism with Communism. It is true that both spring from an individual dissatisfaction with present social conditions, that both attempt to outline a new political order, that both strive to banish material poverty and that both seek the causes of the present disjointed situation not in human character but in peculiar economic and political arrangements.

But there are wide divergences between Socialism and Communism. Socialism aims at a community of the means of production. Communism seeks a community of the means of enjoyment as well. Socialism preserves the right to personality. Communism treats everybody as alike in capacities and rights, and would blot out all political and social distinctions introducing a pure equality. Socialism insists on the right of every one to produce economic goods, to that end asks the state to furnish gratis the means of production, and endeavors to secure for every one the right to the full return of his labor. Communism, on the contrary, regards the state alone as entitled to both the production and the distribution of goods, and demands for every one that the state furnish equally means of subsistence and of education. It guarantees to every person the right to the enjoyment of life, but it lays upon him also the duty of rendering service. So Communism stands for state production, for the abolition of private property, and the introduction of a community of goods.

Modern Socialism came into being with the ideas that resulted in the French Revolution. It occurred to the mind of the multitude that political equality and the complete freedom of the person needed for their perfection a change in the matter of ownership, of possession. At the same time there arose in most of the European countries, a mighty industrial movement. Capital became mobile, great individual properties rapidly arose, and the contrast between poverty and riches became more accentuated. There were developed, in the intensified dissatisfaction, jealous views respecting the widely differing values placed upon human labor. Then came the desire for a generalized means of production, and from this desire Socialism was born.

Once born, Socialism sought a scientific basis. It found it in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. Smith had asserted, and no one had contradicted him that labor is the source of all value. Grant this and it follows as a logical corollary that the financial product of labor belongs to the labor that produced it, and not, as heretofore, to the few "undertakers" as profits. Smith, indeed, never advanced any such idea, but in the thought suggested by him Socialism found a scientific foundation on which to base its economic theory.

Not in the land of Adam Smith, but in France, did Socialism come into being. The first to seize upon the idea that labor is the source of all value and to make it the corner stone of a philosophy of life was Saint-Simon, who looked upon himself as an inspired prophet of a divine revelation, which was to become the saving faith of men. "With the magic

wand of religion he smote the minds of men, but the springs of their judgment did not open." His life was a series of abortive efforts. He was the product of peculiar antitheses. In him an unbridled phantasy was joined to a fierce hunger of knowledge and a rich mentality was coupled with a feverish enthusiasm. His writings revolve constantly about a single thought,—the removal of the nobility and the clergy from their supposedly usurped position of power in the state and society, and the transfer of the government to those who, by reason of their labor and their knowledge, would advance human morals. Saint-Simon was the first Christian Socialist of modern times.

With Saint-Simon must be joined the name of Charles Fourier. All his life long compelled to follow, in a subordinate capacity, mercantile pursuits, Fourier nevertheless constantly opposed trade and steadily complained of his fate. He would be the founder of a new sociology, a sort of social Columbus, discovering a new world. He believed that a new social order could be established, in which the interests of the individual could be made to coincide with the interests of all. He held that value should be based upon capacity to contribute to the general welfare, and that no one, impelled by the instinct of self-preservation should exploit or injure another. Transferring Newton's law of attraction to the economic world, he deduced therefrom a theory of social organization, a species of Socialistic summer night's dream.

While Fourier derived his Socialism from the satisfaction of individual impulses, Louis Blanc, on the other hand, introduced the idea of the state. He made the capitalistic method of production the center of his attack, and in his effort to trace back the causal relations of historic events to economic determinants he may be regarded as the predecessor of Karl Marx.

It is to the treatment of these three schools of socialistic thought that Professor Warschauer devoted himself, developing the manifold divergences and the manifold points of contact which they present. The material is set forth in no partisan spirit, but in a clear, interesting and scientific treatment the volume aims at being a contribution to the history of civilization. The book is exceedingly readable, with a style especially pleasing to one who has been accustomed to the dusty pages of most German writers.

B. E. H.